

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No.: 10/510,685

Attorney Docket No.: Q83961

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Figures 1, 2, 3, and 4 have been amended to include labels for better descriptiveness.

Attachment: Five (5) Replacement Sheets (Figs. 1-5)

REMARKS

General remarks

Claims 1-25 are all the claims pending in the application.

The objection to the drawings is respectfully submitted to be overcome by the replacement drawing sheets submitted herewith.

Fig. 1 has been amended to replace “8” with “6” to indicate receiver 6, to remove arrowheads from “M” and “C” so as to not confuse indicators with representation of data transfer; and to indicate separate data streams by letters “y” and “z.” Support for these clarifications can be found throughout the specification, for example, at page 8, line 28.

Fig. 3 has been amended to indicate that the entire drawing is directed to down-link adapter 7, to place an arrowhead on the line above the line connecting 71 and 72.n, to place an arrowhead on the line connecting SYS_SYNC and 73.n; and to extend one of the arrows from 79 to 72.n. Support for these clarifications can be found throughout the specification, for example, at page 12, lines 13-15.

Fig. 4 has been amended to indicate that the entire drawing is directed to up-link adapter 5, to place an arrowhead on line connecting 51 and 59, to clarify the representation of protocol driver 58, to connect various representations in accordance with the specification. Support for these clarifications can be found throughout the specification, for example, at page 13, lines 7-11.

Applicant has amended the specification so as to take into account the changes to the drawing figures. The amendments to the specification contain no new matter.

The claims have been amended in a non-narrowing manner for the sake of improved conformity to US practice. No new matter has been added.

The prior art rejections

Claims 1-5, 7-17, and 20-25

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-17, and 20-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,491,257 to Emmons Jr., et al. (“Emmons”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,498,922 to Lazaris-Brunner et al. (“Lazaris”).

Applicants respectfully note that Emmons does not teach limitations presently claimed and that Lazaris does not make up the deficiency to arrive at the present claims.

First, Emmons does not teach the presently claimed computation center. Claim 1 recites “respective computation centers” that each have a corresponding digital channel. Claim 14 recites the steps of “providing data to respective computation centers” and “transmitting a digital channel...to a respective computation center.”

The Examiner points to Emmons at column 2, lines 42-50, 65-67 and column 3, lines 1-10 as teaching the claimed component and the claimed steps. Emmons does disclose that its terrestrial stations “desirably perform telemetry, tracking, and control functions for the constellation of communication satellites 120.” But Emmons does not disclose any computation centers having a corresponding digital channel. The Examiner further points to column 2, lines 35-65 and column 3, lines 10-13, but none of the communication satellites 120, terrestrial stations 150, or communication units 130 have a digital channel corresponding to it.

Second, Emmons does not teach a down-link adapter. Claim 1 recites a “down-link adapter (7) connected to a receiver or group of receivers...adapted for extracting...said digital channel corresponding to only said respective computation center.” Claim 14 recites the steps of “transmitting a digital channel...to a respective computation center...connected to a down-link adapter” and “extracting from said down-link transmission, by said down-link adapter, only said digital channel corresponding to the respective computation center.”

The Examiner points to Emmons at column 2, lines 42-50, 65-67 and column 3, lines 1-10 as teaching the claimed component and the claimed steps. Emmons does teach that satellite 120 can send messages to or receive messages from terrestrial stations. But Emmons does not teach any adapter or any extracting of a digital channel from multiplexed data.

Third, Lazaris does not teach the presently claimed satellite system. Claim 1 recites “a satellite system using at least one satellite (2) having an on-board processor for multiplexing up-link data received and broadcasting said multiplexed data in a down-link transmission.” Claim 14 recites “at least one satellite (2) of said system multiplexing up-link data by means of an on-board processor and broadcasting said multiplexed data in down-link transmission.”

The Examiner points to Lazaris at column 3, lines 28-56; column 4, lines 52-67; column 5, lines 1-15; and column 8, lines 1-17 as teaching the claimed component and the claimed steps. Lazaris discloses circuitry for filtering individual channels of information from multiplexed beams received at uplink antennas (column 3, lines 39-41). The disclosure of Lazarus, however, does not provide that a digital channel is extracted from the multiplexed data for each corresponding computation center. In contrast, Lazaris is directed to a satellite system for

providing regional audio or visual programming; so, it teaches away from computation centers corresponding to only a particular channel since multiple channels are desirable in Lazaris.

One skilled in the art would not combine Lazaris with Emmons since the circuitry of Lazaris teaches away from transmitting a digital channel to a respective computation center as presently claimed. Furthermore, even if Emmons and Lazaris were combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner, such a combination would still not read on the presently claimed system because such a system or method would lack a computation center having a corresponding digital channel as well as a down-link adapter for extracting the digital channel.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 6, 18, and 19

At pages 8-9, the Examiner rejects claims 6 and 18-19 as allegedly being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Emmons in view of Lazaris in further view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0135511 to Zhao et al. (“Zhao”).

Applicants respectfully note that Emmons does not teach limitations presently claimed as detailed in remarks above and that neither Lazaris nor Zhao make up the deficiency to arrive at the present claims. In particular, Zhao does not teach a computation center having a corresponding digital channel or a down-link adapter for extracting the digital channel. So, even if Emmons, Lazaris, and Zhao were combined, they would not read on the present claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion and request for telephone interview

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicant herewith petitions the Director of the USPTO to extend the time for reply to the above-identified Office Action for an appropriate length of time, if necessary. Unless a check is attached, any fee due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) is being paid via the USPTO Electronic Filing System, or if not paid through EFS, the USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

/Kelly G. Hyndman 39,234/
Kelly G. Hyndman
Registration No. 39,234

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 31, 2007